

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a Restriction Requirement mailed on January 23, 2009. Prior to this response, claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 20, 22-28, 30-38, and 41-42 were pending. After canceling claims 6 and 27, claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11, 13-17, 20, 22-26, 28, 30-38, and 41-42 remain pending pending.

The Office Action states that an election is required between a variation where a job log is maintained by the imaging device (Fig. 10) and a variation where the client receives job completion notices from the imaging device (Fig. 12).

The Applicant respectfully submits that primary difference between Figs. 10 and 12 is that Fig. 10 shows a job history database being maintained by the imaging device, and the Fig. 12 shows the job history being maintained by the client device. Both figures show a job completion notice being sent to the client. In Fig. 10, the job history is passed to a web server, which passes the job history to a web browser in the client. However, the limitation of sending a job completion notice is never expressly recited in any of the claims.

The variation of the client maintaining the job history was recited in claims 2 and 21 of the claims as originally filed. However during prosecution, this limitation was dropped. Only the limitation of the job history being maintained by the imaging device (Fig. 10) is recited in the current claims. More explicitly, independent claims 1 and 41 recite that the job record is maintained with the imaging device, while claims 20 and 42 recite that a repository (job record) resides in the imaging device. All claims dependent from claims 1 and 20 necessarily recite these limitations.

Since the limitation of maintaining the job record in the client was never considered a primary limitation, no dependent claims were written in support of this limitation. That is, none of the claims explicitly recite the limitation of “sending a job completion notice from the imaging device to the client” as would be required to support the limitation of the job record being maintained by the client.

Some claims (6 and 27) recite the limitation of sending a filtered job history to the client, but these claims are still dependent from claims 1 and 20, which recite that the job history is maintained in the imaging device. Thus, claims 6 and 27 recite that the (primary) job record is maintained in the imaging device and that a filtered record is maintained in the client device. Again however, these claims do not recite the sending of job completion notifications from the imaging device to the client.

In an effort to be responsive, claims 6 and 27 have been canceled, with traverse, based upon the assumption that the Examiner considers a filtered job history to a job completion notice. However as noted above, none of the claims actually recite the limitation of sending a job completion notice from the imaging device to the client. Alternately stated, the invention can be practiced with a (primary) job history stored in the imaging device and a filtered history stored in the client, and the Applicant requests that claims 6 and 27 be reentered into the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/20/2009

/Mali/

Gerald Maliszewski
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829
Telephone: (858) 451-9950
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869
gerry@ipatentit.net